

#### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-82 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 19, 33, 36, 39, 43, 48, 51, 54, 57, 60, and 78, being independent.

Claim 82 is newly added.

Claims 1, 8, 17, 19, 24, 26, 33, 36, 39, 42, 43, 47-54, 57-60, 66, 75, and 78 are amended herein. Applicant has also made amendments throughout the claims to correct grammatical errors and other informalities found therein. Further, Applicant has amended paragraph [0080] of the specification to exclude wireless media. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure. No new matter has been added. Favorable consideration of the amendments is respectfully requested.

#### § 101 REJECTIONS

Claims 19-35, 43-48, 51-53, 57-76, 77-78, and 81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and will treat the claims in the order presented in the Office Action.

The Office Action stated that Claim 48 "recites the steps of receiving a first stream and concurrently receiving a second stream but there is no act performed on the first and second streams to produce a result that is useful, concrete and tangible" (page 3). However, Claim 48 further recites "wherein the second stream comprises a stream of

multimedia data of the multimedia presentation being multicast.” Therefore, in other words, Claim 48 recites multicasting the second stream, which constitutes producing a result that is useful, concrete and tangible. Furthermore, Applicant has amended Claim 48 to recite “mapping the first stream from the preselected first channel to a plurality of channels.” Accordingly, the method of “mapping,” as presently recited in Claim 48, also produces a result that is useful, concrete and tangible. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection as to Claim 48 be withdrawn.

The Office Action further rejected Claims 60-76 and 77-78 as reciting only software components (page 4). Applicant hereby amends Claims 60 and 78 to recite “a physical device that multicasts the second plurality of streams over the network” and “means for multicasting the second plurality of streams from a physical device,” respectively. Therefore, Claims 60 and 78 recite structural and functional components and do not recite a “computer program per se” (Office Action, page 4). Claims 61-76 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 60 and Claim 77 recites “[a] computer-accessible medium containing components as recited in claim 61.” Thus, Claims 60-78 recite structural and functional components and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Finally, the Office Action stated that Claims 19-35, 43-47, 51-53, 57-59, and 81 were rejected because they recite a “computer-accessible medium,” which allegedly can include wireless media. Applicant hereby amends paragraph [0080] of the specification to exclude “wireless media.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

The Office Action set forth the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

- Claims 1-8, 11-12 14, 19-26, 29-30, 32-57, 60-65, 69-70, 72, and 77-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Agraharam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,845,399; hereinafter, "Agraharam") in view of a publication entitled "SDP: Session Description Protocol," authored by Handley and Jacobson (hereinafter, "HandJac");
- Claims 13, 31, and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of Agraharam and HandJac in view of a publication entitled "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications," authored by Schulzrinne et al. (hereinafter, "Schulzrinne");
- Claims 15-16, 18, 73-74, and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of Agraharam and HandJac in view of Maes et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0128342; hereinafter, "Maes");
- Claims 9-10, 27-28, and 67-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of Agraharam and HandJac in view of a publication entitled "IP Multicast in RealSystem G2," authored by Thomas (hereinafter, "Thomas"); and
- Claims 17 and 75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of Agraharam and HandJac in view of Maes, in further view of Schulzrinne.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and further requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. Furthermore, without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application,

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 19, 33, 36, 39, 43, 48, 51, 54, 57, 60, and 78 in an effort to further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the references cited above. Applicant will address the claims in the same order as set forth in the Office Action.

Agraharam is directed to, and discloses, a method and apparatus that enhances a multicast information stream in a communication network (Col. 2, lines 65-67). Specifically, a first multicast stream is received through a communication network and is then enhanced at substantially the same time as when the first stream is received (Col. 2, line 67 – Col. 3, line 4). Agraharam further discloses that enhancement may include adding transcribed content, adding translated content, or adding content to the first information stream (Col. 3, lines 4-10). The enhanced stream is then sent to a user, through the communication network, as a second multicast information stream (Col. 3, lines 10-12). Agraharam discloses that multiple information streams may be enhanced and sent to multiple users (Col. 4, lines 12-14).

For at least the following reasons, however, Agraharam neither discloses, nor suggests, each and every limitation of independent Claim 1. For instance, Agraharam fails to disclose at least “mapping the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels,” as presently recited in Claim 1, as amended. Rather, Agraharam merely discloses receiving a first multicast information stream, enhancing such a stream, and then sending the enhanced stream to a user as a second multicast information stream. Agraharam does not disclose mapping either the first multicast information stream or the second multicast information stream

to any channel, let alone a plurality of channels. In fact, Agraharam fails to mention “mapping” anywhere in the Agraharam disclosure. Accordingly, Claim 1 is patentable over Agraharam for at least the foregoing reasons.

The Office Action acknowledges that Agraharam does not specifically disclose “includes a dedicated announcement stream, wherein the announcement stream includes presentation description information of the multimedia presentation” but further asserts that HandJac teaches this limitation (Office Action, page 6). HandJac is directed to, and discloses, a session description protocol (“SDP”), which is intended to describe multimedia sessions for the purposes of session announcement, session invitation, and other forms of multimedia session initiation (Abstract). More specifically, the SDP described in HandJac is meant to convey information about media streams in multimedia sessions to allow recipients of a session description to participate in the session (section 5). HandJac further states that the SDP must convey sufficient information to allow one to join a session (section 5).

However, regardless of whether Agraharam discloses “a dedicated announcement stream” and “wherein the announcement stream includes presentation description information of the multimedia presentation,” as presently recited in Claim 1, to which Applicant does not admit, HandJac also fails to disclose “mapping the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels,” as presently recited in Claim 1. For instance, like Agraharam, the multimedia sessions disclosed in HandJac are simply not mapped to a plurality of channels. Accordingly, Agraharam and HandJac, either singularly or in combination with one

another, fail to render independent Claim 1 obvious. Moreover, because neither reference discloses "mapping the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels," as recited in Claim 1, as amended, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Agraharam and HandJac. Likewise, because both Agraharam and HandJac both fail to disclose the above limitation and neither reference provided a teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the two, it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to try to make the invention as recited in Claim 1. As a result, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent Claim 1 is patentable over both Agraharam and HandJac, either singularly or in combination with one another.

The Office Action further states that "[s]ince Claim 19 is a computer-accessible medium...version of method Claim 1, the rejection of Claim 1 also applies to Claim 19" (page 6). Independent Claim 19 recites, in part:

A computer-accessible medium having computer-executable instructions to perform operations, comprising:

map the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the plurality of first streams to a plurality of channels...

However, as stated above in relation to Claim 1, both Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose "map the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the plurality of first streams to a plurality of channels," as presently recited in Claim 19, as amended. Therefore, Agraharam and HandJac, either alone or in combination with one another, fail to render independent Claim 19 obvious. Furthermore, because both references fail to disclose the above limitation and neither reference provides a teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine Agraharam with HandJac, it would not have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art to combine Agraharam and HandJac. Similarly, since Agraharam and HandJac both fail to disclose at least the foregoing limitation of Claim 19, it would not have been obvious to try, at the time of the invention, to make the computer-accessible medium recited in Claim 19. Thus, Claim 19 is patentable over both Agraharam and HandJac.

Claims 33 (directed to a computer-accessible medium) and 36 (directed to a method) both recite, in part:

mapping a dedicated announcement stream; that presents description information of the multimedia presentation, and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels.

The Office Action states that the rejections of Claims 1 and 7 also apply to Claim 33 and that since Claim 36 "is a method claim version of Claim 33," the same rejection also applies to Claim 36 (page 6-7). Yet, both Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose, or even suggest, "mapping a dedicated announcement...and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels," as presently recited in Claims 33 and 36, as amended. Therefore, because the proposed combination lacks the limitations noted above and further fails to provide any motivation for such a combination, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Agraharam and HandJac. Likewise, since Agraharam and HandJac both fail to disclose the above limitation of Claims 33 and 36, it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to try to modify Agraharam to make the invention recited in Claims 33 and 36. Therefore, Claims 33 and 36 are both patentable over Agraharam in view of HandJac.

The Office Action states that because Claim 39 is "an independent Claim that recites the same limitations of Claims 1 and 3," the same rejection also applies (page 7). Furthermore, since Claim 43 is "a computer-accessible medium version of Claim 39, the same rejection thereof also applies" (page 7). Claims 39 and 43 recite, in part:

mapping a dedicated announcement stream, that presents description information of the multimedia presentation, and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels

However, for at least the reasons set forth above, neither Agraharam nor HandJac disclose, or even suggest, "mapping a dedicated announcement stream...and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels," as presently recited in Claims 39 and 43, as amended. In fact, neither of these claims even mentions the term "mapping" or any other like terms. Therefore, because each reference, and the proposed combination, lacks the limitations noted above, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Agraharam and HandJac. Similarly, since HandJac neither discloses, nor suggests, mapping a dedicated announcement stream to a plurality of channels, as presently recited in Claims 39 and 43, it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to try to modify Agraharam to make the inventions recited in Claims 39 and 43. Thus, Claims 39 and 43 are patentable over Agraharam and HandJac, either singularly or in combination with one another.

The Office Action further states that Claim 48 recites "the same steps of method claim 39" and that Claim 51 is "a computer-accessible medium having computer executable instructions to perform the same steps of Claim 48" (page 7-8). Therefore,



the Office Action states that the rejection of Claim 39 applies thereto (page 7-8). However, both Agraharam and HandJac neither discloses, nor suggests, "mapping the first stream from the preselected first channel to a plurality of channels," as presently recited in Claims 48 and 51, as amended. In fact, as stated above, Agraharam does not mention mapping any type of multicast information stream and HandJac further fails to remedy the deficiencies with regard to Agraharam. For at least the foregoing reason, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Agraharam and HandJac to arrive at the inventions recited in Claims 48 and 51. Likewise, because both references fail to recite at least "mapping the first stream from the preselected first channel to a plurality of channels," as is presently recited in Claims 48 and 51, it would not have been obvious, at the time of invention, to try to make the inventions recited in Claims 48 and 51. Accordingly, neither Agraharam nor HandJac, either singularly or in combination with one another, renders Claims 48 and 51 obvious.

Independent Claims 54 and 57 also were rejected as obvious over Agraharam in view of HandJac. The Office Action states that because "Claim 54 is an independent claim that recites the same steps of Claim 48 and 7" and that since "Claim 57 is a computer-accessible medium version of Claim 54," then the rejections with regard to Claims 48 and 7 also apply (page 8). However, neither Agraharam nor HandJac disclose, or even suggest:

receiving a unit of data from a preselected first channel, wherein the first channel transports a plurality of units of data of a multimedia presentation being multicast, wherein the plurality of units each comprise a preselected number of previous subunits of data of the multimedia presentation being multicast,

as presently recited in Claims 54 and 57. For instance, the portions of Agraharam cited in the Office Action (Col. 5, line 55; Col. 6, lines 6 and 31-52) do not disclose the above limitation. Rather, the cited portions of Agraharam disclose enhancing a first information stream at substantially the same time the first stream is received (Col. 5, lines 55-56). Agraharam further discloses sending the converted content to a user access device, such as a user's personal computer, in the form of a transmission stream so that the user receives the transmission stream along with the original stream (Col. 6, lines 31-36). However, Agraharam, and HandJac, for that matter, fail to disclose "receiving a unit of data from a preselected first channel" and "wherein the plurality of units each comprise a preselected number of previous subunits of data of the multimedia presentation being multicast," as is presently recited in Claims 54 and 57. In fact, neither of the two references mentions units of data or subunits of data, as presently recited in Claims 54 and 57. Therefore, for at least this reason, Claims 54 and 57 are patentable over Agraharam and HandJac.

Moreover, as stated above, Agraharam and HandJac also fail to disclose "mapping at least one of the plurality of units of data to a plurality of channels," as presently recited in Claims 54 and 57, as amended. For example, because both Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose a plurality of units of data, as presently recited in Claims 54 and 57, it logically flows that these references also cannot disclose "mapping at least one of the plurality of units of data to a plurality of channels." Furthermore, neither Agraharam nor HandJac even mention mapping at least one of the plurality of units of data to a plurality of channels, as presently recited in Claims 54 and 57 as amended. Accordingly, for at least

the reasons set forth above, Claims 54 and 57 are patentable over Agraharam and HandJac. Since both Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose at least the above limitations of Claims 54 and 57, it also would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Agraharam and HandJac. Additionally, as the Office Action did not identify a motivation to combine the references, it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to try to make the inventions recited in Claims 54 and 57.

The Office Action further rejected Claims 60, 77, 78, and 81 stating that since "Claim 60 is a system version of Claim 1, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 60" (page 8). Moreover, because Claim 77 depends from Claim 61, which depends from Claim 60, Claim 78 is "a means-plus-function version of Claim 60," and since "Claim 81 is a computer-accessible medium version of Claim 78," the rejections set forth in relation to Claim 1 also apply to these claims (page 8-9). Applicant respectfully disagrees that Claim 60 is a system version of Claim 1, as rejected, because Claim 60 recites "a mapper to map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels." Prior to the present amendments, however, Claim 1 did not include the foregoing recitation. Moreover, Claim 78 recites, on several occasions, the term "means for," thus distinguishing Claim 78 from Claim 60.

However, Applicant believes that the reasons for rejecting Claim 1 were, and still are, inadequate to reject Claim 60 because prior to Applicant's present amendment, Claim 1 did not recite a mapper or any type of mapping, which was recited in Claim 60. Therefore, Claim 60 is patentable because the rejection applied to Claim 60 did not treat, or disclose a reference that described, "a mapper to map the announcement stream and

a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels," as presently recited in Claim 60. Moreover, as to Claims 60 and 77, each claim recites, either directly or indirectly (Claim 77 recites the following element via its dependency on Claim 60), "a mapper to map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels." However, for at least the foregoing reasons, both Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose, or even suggest, a mapper or any mechanism which maps the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels, as presently recited.

In addition, Claims 78 (directed to a method) and 81 (directed to a computer-accessible medium) both recite, in part, "means for mapping the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to one or more channels of a plurality of channels," as is presently recited in Claims 78 and 81. However, as stated above, both Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose at least this limitation. Furthermore, because the references would not have taught, suggested or motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Agraharam and HandJac, it would not have been obvious to do so. Likewise, because Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose at least "means for mapping," it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to try to make the inventions recited in Claims 78 and 81. Therefore, Claims 60, 77, 78, and 81 are patentable over Agraharam and HandJac, either singularly or in combination with one another.

Dependent Claims 2-8, 11, 12, and 14 depend from independent Claim 1, dependent Claims 18-26, 29, 30, and 32 depend from independent Claim 19, dependent

Claims 34 and 35 depend from independent Claim 33, dependent Claims 37 and 38 depend from independent Claim 36, dependent Claims 40-42 depend from independent Claim 39, dependent Claims 44-47 depend from independent Claim 43, dependent Claims 49 and 50 depend from independent Claim 48, dependent Claims 52 and 53 depend from independent Claim 51, dependent Claims 55-56 depend from independent Claim 54, dependent Claims 61-65, 69, 70, and 72 depend from independent Claim 60, and dependent Claims 79 and 80 depend from independent Claim 78. Each of these dependent claims is patentable by virtue of their dependency, as well as for additional features that each claim recites. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Dependent Claims 13, 31, and 71 were rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Agraharam-HandJac in view of Schulzrinne. Dependent Claims 13 and 31 depend from independent Claims 1 and 19, respectively, which are both patentable over Agraharam in view of HandJac for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to Claims 1 and 19. Moreover, like Agraharam and HandJac, Schulzrinne also does not disclose mapping (Claim 1) or map (Claim 19) "the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels," as presently recited in Claims 1 and 19, and, therefore, does not remedy the deficiencies noted above in Agraharam and HandJac. Therefore, by virtue of their dependency on Claims 1 and 19, Claims 13 and 31 are patentable over the combination of Agraharam, HandJac and Schulzrinne.

Claim 71, due to its dependency on independent Claim 60, recites, in part, “a mapper to map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels.” As stated above, independent Claim 60 is patentable over both Agraharam and HandJac for at least the reasons set forth with regard to Claim 60. Furthermore, Schulzrinne neither discloses, nor suggests, “a mapper to map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels,” as presently recited in Claim 60. Thus, Schulzrinne fails to remedy the deficiencies with regard to Claim 60. As a result, Claim 71, by virtue of its dependency from Claim 60, is patentable over Agraharam, HandJac and Schulzrinne, either singularly or in combination with one another. Additionally, because each reference fails to disclose the above limitations and none of the three references provide a teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Agraharam, HandJac and Schulzrinne. Likewise, for at least the same reasons, it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to try to make the inventions recited in Claims 13, 31, and 71. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 15, 16, and 18, which all depend from independent Claim 1, were further rejected as being unpatentable over Agraharam and HandJac in view of Maes (Office Action, page 15). However, as stated above, Agraharam and HandJac both fail to disclose “mapping the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels,” as presently recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, Maes also fails to disclose, or even suggest, this limitation of Claim 1,

making Claim 1 patentable over Agraharam, HandJac and Maes. Therefore, Claims 15, 16, and 18, by virtue of their dependency from Claim 1, are also patentable over this combination of references.

Dependent Claims 73, 74, and 76, which are each dependent upon independent Claim 60, are also patentable over the combination of Agraharam, HandJac and Maes. For at least the reasons stated above with regard to Claim 60, both Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose "a mapper to map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels." Furthermore, Maes also does not disclose this limitation, making Claim 60 patentable over all three references. Thus, by virtue of their dependency on Claim 60, Claims 73, 74, and 76 are also patentable over the combination of Agraharam, HandJac and Maes. Furthermore, since each reference fails to disclose a mapper or map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels, as presently recited in Claims 74, 74, and 76, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine these references. Furthermore, for at least the above reason, it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to try to make the inventions recited in Claims 73, 74, and 76.

Dependent Claims 9 and 10 and Claims 27 and 28, which depend from independent Claims 1 and 19, respectively, were rejected as being unpatentable over Agraharam and HandJac in view of Thomas (Office Action, page 17). However, as stated above, Agraharam and HandJac both fail to disclose "mapping the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels,"

as presently recited in Claims 1 and 19. Furthermore, Thomas also fails to disclose, or even suggest, this limitation of Claims 1 and 19, making Claims 1 and 19 patentable over Agraharam, HandJac and Thomas. Therefore, Claims 9 and 10 and Claims 27 and 28, by virtue of their dependency on Claims 1 and 19, respectively, are also patentable over this combination.

Dependent Claims 67 and 68, which are each dependent upon independent Claim 60, are also patentable over the combination of Agraharam, HandJac and Thomas. For at least the reasons stated above with regard to Claim 60, both Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose "a mapper to map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels." Furthermore, Thomas also does not disclose this limitation, making Claim 60 patentable over all three references. Thus, by virtue of their dependency on Claim 60, Claims 67 and 68 are also patentable over the combination of Agraharam, HandJac and Thomas for at least this reason alone. Furthermore, since each reference fails to disclose a mapper or map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels, as presently recited in Claims 67 and 68, and neither reference includes a teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Agraharam, HandJac and Thomas. Furthermore, for at least the above reason, it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to try to make the inventions recited in Claims 67 and 68.



Dependent Claim 17, which depends from independent Claim 1, was rejected as being unpatentable over Agraharam and HandJac in view of Maes, in further view of Schulzrinne (Office Action, page 20). However, for at least the reasons set forth above, Agraharam and HandJac both fail to disclose "mapping the announcement stream and the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels," as presently recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, both Maes and Schulzrinne also fail to disclose, or even suggest, this limitation of Claim 1, making Claim 1 patentable over Agraharam, HandJac, Maes, and Schulzrinne. Therefore, Claim 17, by virtue of its dependency on Claim 1, is also patentable over this combination.

Dependent Claim 75, which is dependent upon independent Claim 60, is also patentable over the combination of Agraharam, HandJac, Maes and Schulzrinne. For at least the reasons stated above with regard to Claim 60, both Agraharam and HandJac fail to disclose "a mapper to map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels." Furthermore, both Maes and Schulzrinne fail to disclose this limitation, and, therefore, fail to remedy the deficiencies in Agraharam and HandJac, making Claim 60 patentable over all four references. Thus, by virtue of its dependency on Claim 60, Claim 75 is also patentable over the combination of Agraharam, HandJac, Maes and Schulzrinne. Furthermore, since each reference fails to disclose a mapper or map the announcement stream and a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams to a plurality of channels, as presently recited in Claim 75, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine these references. Furthermore, for at least the above reason, it would not have been obvious,

at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to try to make the inventions recited in Claim 75.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-81 and newly added Claim 82 are not obvious, and therefore, the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-82 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: 9/12/08

By: Brett J. Schlameus

David S. Lee  
Reg. No. 38222  
Brett J. Schlameus  
Reg No. 60827  
206-315-5222